



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: Riveiera Half Pipe Modification (PCPB T20060953)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed to re-grade the existing earthen half pipe (about 350 feet long) to create a half pipe of the same length to current industry demands

PROJECT LOCATION: Riviera Terrain Park in Squaw Valley ski area, Olympic Valley, Placer County

PROPONENT: Squaw Valley Ski Corp, PO Box 2007, 1960 Squaw Valley Road, Olympic Valley, CA 96146 (530)581-7231

The public comment period for this document closes on **April 11, 2007**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter (3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603) and at Tahoe City Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified of the upcoming public hearing. Additional information may be obtained by contacting Maywan Krach, 530-745-3132, at the Environmental Coordination Services between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Newspaper: Sierra Sun

Publish date: Tuesday, March 13, 2007



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ☐ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Riviera Half Pipe Modification	Plus# PCPB T20060953
Description: Proposed to re-grade the existing earthen half pipe (about 350 feet long) to create a half pipe of the same length to current industry demands.	
Location: Riviera Terrain Park in Squaw Valley ski area, Olympic Valley	
Project Owner/Applicant: Squaw Valley Ski Corp, PO Box 2007, 1960 Squaw Valley Road, Olympic Valley, CA 96146 (530)581-7231	
County Contact Person: Stacy Wydra	530-581-6288

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on _____. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Tahoe City Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Planning Commission. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, at (530) 745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

The owner/applicant hereby acknowledges that the above mitigation measures will be incorporated as part of the project.		Recorder's Certification
_____ Name of Owner (print)		
_____ Name of Owner (sign)	_____ Date	
_____ Name of Applicant (print)		
_____ Name of Applicant (sign)	_____ Date	



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: Riviera Half Pipe Modification	Plus#: PCPB T20060953
Entitlements: Conditional Use Permit	
Site Area: 1.54 acres (64,000 square feet)	APN# 069-310-011
Location: Squaw Valley Ski Resort, Riviera Halfpipe	
Project Description: The project proposes to regrade the existing earthen half pipe (approximately 350-feet in length) to create a half pipe of the same length to current ski industry demands. Due to the current half pipes longitudinal slope (20% +/-) verses the current industry standard (30% +/-) the grading of the pipe will require fills at the upper portion with cuts at the lower end. The pipe is designed and graded to obtain an earthwork balance thereby not requiring any import or export of material. The grading limits for the pipe are approximately 1.5-acres. One tree requires removal and the existing drainage is actually "cleaned-up" with the addition of several water bars to divert water away from the man made halfpipe. Culverts under the pipe berm serve the evenly spaced water bars which discharge to existing drainage flow lines. Culvert outfalls are fitted with erosion protection measures per County plate U-2. Custom revegetation specifications seed mix which will be used for this project.	

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan / Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	FR (Forest Recreation)	Squaw Valley	Existing Halfpipe & Ski Trails
North	same as project site	same as project site	Ski Lifts/Runs/Trails
South	same as project site	same as project site	Ski Lifts/Runs/Trails
East	same as project site	same as project site	Ski Lifts/Runs/Trails
West	same as project site	same as project site	Ski Lifts/Runs/Trails

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference can occur:

- ➔ County-wide General Plan EIR
- ➔ 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)			x	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)			x	
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			x	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			x	

Discussion- Items I-1,3:

The project site is located within an area currently used as a ski resort owned and operated by Squaw Valley Ski Corporation. The site is currently graded for the existing halfpipe and five existing light towers are installed along the halfpipe. Surrounding the halfpipe are existing ski runs, ski lifts, trees, low-lying vegetation and minimal groundcover.

The proposed project site is not within a scenic vista and will not create a substantial adverse scenic impact. The project site is located towards the lower area of the ski hill and will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in that there is currently an existing halfpipe. Only one tree will be required to be removed as a result of the modification to the existing halfpipe. The removal of one tree will not create a significant adverse impact on the scenic area. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-2:

There are no historic buildings within the vicinity of the proposed project site and the site is not within a state scenic highway. The project site will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, and rock outcroppings. There are no rock outcroppings within the project area of disturbance. A single tree will be removed as a result of the project proposal resulting in a less than significant impact. Many trees exist within the general vicinity that will remain and the site is currently disturbed due to the ski hill operations and activities. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-4:

The project proposes to install one additional light tower to match the existing five light towers lined along the existing halfpipe. Each tower is 55-feet tall and has four (4) lights per tower, containing high pressure sodium yellow bulbs at 1,000 watts per bulb. Therefore, the project would result in 24 high pressure sodium bulbs, 140,000 lumen per bulb, 560,000 lumen per tower for a total of 3,360,000 lumens. As result of the project some of the existing light towers may have to be relocated or adjusted as a result of the new cut and design of the halfpipe. Staff believes the one additional light tower will not create an adverse affect to the day or nighttime views in the area in that lighting on the mountain currently exists. For comparison, the Mountain Run of the ski hill (the main run which runs from High Camp down to Base Camp) contains 64 light towers with an average of three lights per tower for a total lumen of 26,880,000. The additional tower will result in a 20 percent increase of lighting in the pipe (project area) and less than one percent increase in lighting on the mountain. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				x
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (EHS, PLN)				x
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				x
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				x

Discussion- Item II-1:

The proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use in that the project site is not located within an area deemed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland).

Discussion- Item II-2:

The project site is located within the Squaw Valley General Plan, land use designation Forest Recreation (FR). The FR land use district is intended to retain the general character of the forest environment while at the same time permit active recreational development. Additionally, there are no policies within the Squaw Valley General Plan regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations. Therefore, it can be determined that the proposed halfpipe modification will not conflict with the Squaw Valley General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations.

Discussion- Item II-3:

The project site is zoned Forest Recreation and will not conflict with agricultural use. Furthermore, there is no Williamson Act contract in place for the project site area.

Discussion- Item II-4:

The project site is currently used as a halfpipe and terrain park for the existing ski operations of the Squaw Valley ski hill. Expanding the existing halfpipe will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use in that the site is not currently used as Farmland.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				x
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)				x

3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)				x
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)				x
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)				x

Discussion- Item III-1:

Based upon the project description the project will not conflict with the Air Quality Plan.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

This proposed project is located in the Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. Based upon the project description the project will not have an impact on air quality.

Discussion- Items III-4,5:

Based upon the project description the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)			x	
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)			x	
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				x
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)			x	
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)			x	
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)			x	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)			x	

8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				x
--	--	--	--	----------

Discussion- Items IV-1,2,4,6:

The proposed project area is bounded by fragmented forested habitats that include existing logging roads and ski trails and lifts. Ongoing activities in the project area and surrounding areas include forest management and recreational uses (mountain biking, hiking, winter uses). The site is disturbed and contains minimal vegetation, including low-lying shrubs.

One 23" fir tree will be removed as a result of the proposed project due to the required finish grading. The tree is located at the top of the pipe, located on the back side of the proposed pipe deck. A 40" fir exists on the south side of the pipe deck and will be protected and not impacted by the construction of the project. Consistent with Placer County standard additional general note 1 (general note 10 on the plans), a small rockery wall is proposed to be placed around the tree's dripline for preservation and protection. Construction fencing will be placed around all trees within the project proximity for protection. The removal of one tree is not a significant impact and a tree replacement plan is not required per the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. However, a landscape and monitoring plan has been provided by the applicants addressing the revegetation of all areas disturbed by construction. The custom revegetation seed mix has been approved as part of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. Monitoring is ensured greater than once a year as the Ski Corporations "Environmental Improvement Department" is constantly maintaining, revegetating (if required) and stabilizing all applicable areas on the mountain throughout the spring/summer months. No additional landscaping, i.e. trees or shrubs are proposed.

The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service in that no special species have been identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project will not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of an endangered, rare, or threatened species in that the site is currently disturbed and the improvements proposed require minimal removal of trees and existing vegetation which could support habitat. Additionally, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

There are no oak woodlands within the project site or surrounding areas. And as discussed above only one fir tree is proposed to be removed and will not be a significant impact.

Discussion- Item IV-5:

There are no known or mapped wetlands within the general vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-7:

The project as designed does not conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance adopted in October of 1991. The provisions of the Ordinance applies to all projects where discretionary permit approvals are required by the County provided, however, no Landmark Tree may be removed without obtaining a Tree Permit pursuant to Section 12.16.060. There are no Landmark Trees proposed to be removed and the one fir tree to be removed is not a protected tree. Furthermore, the tree ordinance requires that when more than 50% of existing native trees, 6" dbh or greater, are removed, the issuance of a tree permit is required. The project does not propose to remove more than 50% of the existing native trees. The removal of one tree is not significant and will not create a significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-8:

There is no known adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applicable to the project site. The project site is currently disturbed and contains minimal vegetation.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				x
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				x
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			x	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)			x	
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)			x	
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			x	

Discussion- Item V-1:

The project site is not listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources therefore, the project will not substantially cause adverse changes in the significance of a historical resource.

Discussion- Item V-2:

Majority of the project site area has already been disturbed for the original construction of the existing halfpipe. The nearest known historic monument is the "Watson Monument" marker defining the emigrant trail. The mark is approximately a half of a mile away from the project site and will not be impacted by the proposed project. There are no known unique archaeological resources within the project site area.

Discussion- Items V-3,4,5,6:

The project site comprises an existing halfpipe with minimal vegetation. At this time there are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features that will be directly or indirectly destroyed with the construction of the project. Furthermore, the physical change of the project site will not affect unique ethnic cultural values as none have been identified within the project site area with the original construction of the halfpipe which exists today. Additionally, there are no existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. The project site is not located within a formal cemetery. No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				x
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		x		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)		x		

4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				x
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		x		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				x
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				x
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				x
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				x

Discussion- Item VI-1:

This project does not propose any features that would expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures.

Discussion- Items VI-2,3,5:

This project proposal would result in the modification of an existing earthen half pipe, 350 feet in length. Grading activities will be associated with the increase in longitudinal slope from approximately 20% to 30%. The project involves cuts and fills up to 30 +/- feet in height, an estimated 12,200 cubic yards in earthwork quantities, and an overall site balance of zero import/export. A total of approximately 1.5 acres of disturbance is expected with the proposed project. To construct the improvements proposed, potentially significant disruption of soils on site could occur. This disruption of soils on the site has the potential to result in significant increases in erosion of soils. The proposed project's impacts associated with soil disruptions, displacements, and compaction of the soil as well as erosion of soils from the site can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the Placer County General Plan and Squaw Valley General Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-2,3,5:

MM VI.1 The applicant shall prepare and submit Grading Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section 2 of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval for all work affecting any facilities dedicated or offered for dedication to Placer County or facilities maintained by the County. The plans shall show all conditions affecting those County facilities as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to those facilities, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. Prior to plan approval, all applicable reproduction costs shall be paid. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Grading Plans. Record Drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

MM VI.2 All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation, tree impacts and tree removal shall be shown on the Grading Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Section 15.48, Placer County Code) and the Placer County Flood Control District's Stormwater Management Manual. The applicant shall pay plan check fees and inspection fees. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Grading Plans are approved and any required temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.

All facilities and/or easements dedicated or offered for dedication to Placer County or to other public agencies which encroach on the project site or within any area to be disturbed by the project construction shall be accurately located on the Grading Plans. The intent of this requirement is to allow review by concerned agencies of any work that may affect their facilities.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Grading Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.

Submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Grading Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Grading Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

Any work affecting facilities maintained by, or easements dedicated or offered for dedication, to Placer County or other public agency may require the submittal and review of appropriate Improvement Plans by ESD or the other agency.

MM VI.3 There shall be no grading or other disturbance of ground between October 15 of any year and May 1 of the following year, unless a Variance has been granted by the RWQCB and the Placer County ESD.

MM VI.4 All grading operations shall occur after snow has melted and when conditions are dry.

MM VI.5 The applicant shall retain a geotechnical engineer to perform construction observation for grading activities.

MM VI.6 Truck routes are to be located across existing logging roads.

MM VI.7 After completion of a construction project, all surplus or waste earthen materials shall be removed from the site and deposited in an approved disposal location or stabilized onsite.

MM VI.8 Dewatering, if necessary, shall be completed in a manner so as to eliminate the discharge of earthen materials from the site.

MM VI.9 If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, 1) A blasting plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with State of California requirements and approved by the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department, 2) Placer County ESD shall be informed 48 hours before blasting, and 3) A permit for blasting shall be obtained from the Placer County Sheriff's Department.

Discussion- Item VI-4:

There are no unique geologic or physical features at this site that could be destroyed, covered or modified, since it is a previously disturbed site.

Discussion- Item VI-6:

This project proposes modifications to an existing half pipe. It does not proposed any changes to features that would alter the deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which might modify a river, stream or lake.

Discussion- Item VI-7:

No avalanches, mud slides or other geologic or geomorphological hazards have been observed at or near this project site. No structures are proposed. Avalanche control is performed by ski patrol to ensure the safety of people at the resort.

Discussion- Item VI-8:

The site is located within Seismic Zone 3 and ground shaking will occur during seismic events on nearby faults. According to a Geotechnical Report by Holdrege & Kull dated October 6, 2006, the soil conditions on site generally consist of dense granular soils with low plasticity. No highly plastic, compressible or potentially expansive soils were encountered. The report finds these soils suitable for reuse as engineered fill and for the planned embankments. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item VI-9:

According to a Geotechnical Report by Holdrege & Kull dated October 6, 2006; the soil conditions on site generally consist of dense granular soils with low plasticity. No potentially expansive soils were encountered. There is no impact.

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (EHS)			x	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			x	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD, EHS)				x
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				x
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				x
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				x
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (EHS, PLN)			x	
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)			x	
9. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				x
10. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				x

Discussion- Items VII-1,2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-3:

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project, therefore, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Discussion- Item VII-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the location of the site will not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Discussion- Items VII-5,6:

The project site is not located within the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan applicable to the Truckee – Tahoe area. Therefore, the project is not within two miles of the Truckee Tahoe Airport and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Additionally, there are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site which would result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.

Discussion- Item VII-7:

The location of the existing halfpipe is not within an area designated as an evacuation area or part of an adopted emergency response plan. The expansion of the halfpipe will not interfere with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan in place for the Squaw Valley ski resort in that a halfpipe currently exists and currently does not interfere with existing emergency response or evacuation plans. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-8:

The project site is located within an area which contains natural vegetation, trees and shrubs. However, the project will not result in a safety hazard for people working or recreating on the project site. The potential for disastrous wild land fires in the Lake Tahoe region exists. However, the proposed halfpipe expansion will not increase the existing fire hazards. Furthermore, majority of the activity associated with the project will be during the winter months when there is snow on the ground further reducing any potential impacts to exposing people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-9:

The project will not create a health hazard or potential health hazard.

Discussion- Item VII-10:

The project will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards? (EHS)				x
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				x
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			x	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (EHS, ESD)		x		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		x		
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (EHS, ESD)		x		
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				x

8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				x
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				x
10. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				x
11. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)		x		

Discussion- Item VIII-1:

Potable water will not be a requirement of this project, so this project will not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source. Therefore, the project will not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:

This project will not utilize groundwater and will not create an impermeable surface. Therefore, the project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

Proposed modifications to existing half pipe increase both the slope and depth of the feature. The post development volume of runoff may be slightly higher due to the potential for increases in the runoff rate; however, this is considered to be less than significant because drainage facilities are generally designed to handle the peak flow runoff. The proposed changes will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern. Therefore, the project's impacts due to substantial alteration in drainage patterns are considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

One tree is proposed for removal. All disturbed areas will be graded and revegetated. No impervious surfaces are proposed. The project's impacts associated with increases in runoff can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing applicable Placer County General Plan and Squaw Valley General Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures- Item VIII-4:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

MM VIII.1 Water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)). BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. All BMPs shall be maintained during construction as required to insure effectiveness. BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to:

- Waterbreaks/waterbars.
- Silt fencing and/or pine needle waddles.
- Hydroseeding and revegetation of disturbed areas.
- Dust control provisions.
- Central staging area.
- Tree protection fencing.

MM VIII.2 The following BMPs shall be listed in the Notes section on the Grading Plan and constructed/installed as a part of the project:

- Protecting existing vegetation onsite to the extent feasible (e.g., installing tree protection fencing during construction).
- Graveling construction entrances to minimize tracking of earthen material to adjoining streets.

- Installing erosion control fencing and vegetation protection on the down slopes of terminal grading activities.
- Installing dikes to divert sheet flow from newly disturbed areas until revegetation can be completed and the ground stabilized.
- Covering bale sumps with straw to detain and filter runoff in channel sections during construction.
- Installing permanent water quality features, such as water breaks and revegetation of disturbed areas to treat and convey runoff.
- Disposing of excess excavated materials (in any) at appropriate disposal sites. Solid debris resulting from activities associated with the construction of the proposed project shall be kept out of Squaw Creek tributary drainages.

MM VIII.3 The following specific construction practices shall be listed in the Notes section on the Grading Plan and implemented as follows:

- Maintain all construction equipment to prevent oil or other fluid leaks.
- Keep stockpiled spill cleanup materials readily accessible.
- Regularly inspect on-site vehicles and equipment for leaks, and repair immediately.
- Check incoming vehicles and equipment (including delivery and employee and subcontractor vehicles) for leaking oil and fluids. Do not allow leaking vehicles or equipment on-site.
- Segregate and recycle wastes, such as greases, used oil or filters, antifreeze, cleaning solutions, automotive batteries, hydraulic, and transmission fluids.
- Always use containment, such as drip pan or drop cloth, to catch spills or leaks when removing or changing fluids.
- Use drip pans for any oil or fluid changes.
- Wet and dry building materials with the potential to pollute runoff shall be handled and delivered with care and stored under cover and/or surrounded by berms and sediment protection fencing when rain is forecast or during wet weather.
- Employees and subcontractors shall be trained in proper material delivery, handling, and storage practices.
- Purchase, transport to site, and use only the amount needed for the work on-site.
- When possible, purchase and use non-hazardous and environmentally friendly materials.
- Label and store all hazardous materials according to local, state and federal regulations.
- The contractor shall dispose of all construction waste at a legal disposal site in accordance with Placer County Specifications.
- Avoid mixing excess amounts of fresh concrete or cement mortar on-site.
- Filter fabric fencing or a combination of straw rolls/filter fabric fencing shall be used to contain concrete washout areas. Concrete washout areas should be located within a building or roadway footprint, if possible, to minimize disturbance to the project site.
- Store dry and wet materials away from waterways and storm drains; cover and contain to protect from rainfall and prevent runoff.

Discussion- Item VIII-5:

The construction of the proposed improvements has the potential to degrade water quality. Stormwater runoff naturally contains numerous constituents; however, urbanization typically increases constituent concentrations to levels that potentially impact water quality. Pollutants associated with stormwater include (but are not limited to) sediment, nutrients, oils/greases, etc. The proposed development has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants and also has the potential to increase the concentration and/or total load of said pollutants in wet weather stormwater runoff. The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing applicable Placer County General Plan and Squaw Valley General Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures- Item VIII-5:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VIII.1

Refer to text in MM VIII.2

Refer to text in MM VIII.3

Discussion- Item VIII-6:

The project could result in increased sediment in stormwater runoff. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used and as such, the potential for this project to violate any water quality standards is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Item VIII-6:

MM VIII.4 In order to minimize potential water quality issues resulting from increased sediment in stormwater runoff, Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be utilized and maintained.

Discussion- Items VIII-7,8,9:

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). No improvements are proposed within a 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be impeded or redirected. The project location is elevated well above areas that are subject to flooding, and therefore there are no impacts due to exposing people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death, including flooding as a result or failure of a levee or dam. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-10:

The project will not alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater.

Discussion- Item VIII-11:

The project area is located in Squaw Valley, north of Squaw Peak. Drainage from the project area flows into the South Fork of Squaw Creek. The construction of the proposed improvements has the potential to degrade water quality. Stormwater runoff naturally contains numerous constituents; however, as the intensity of land use by man increases, the constituent concentrations typically increase to levels that potentially impact water quality. Pollutants associated with stormwater include (but are not limited to) suspended solids, nutrients, oils/greases, construction waste, metals, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc. The proposed project has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants and also has the potential to increase the concentration and/or total load of said pollutants in wet weather stormwater runoff. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present during construction and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. In this case, it is primarily the shaping of the deeper, longer half pipe that could contribute to erosion and water quality degradation. Soil disruption also has the potential to increase siltation of Squaw Creek. Although Squaw Creek is located in the general vicinity of the proposed project, most project area drainage is by sheet flow, which is interrupted by downed timber, pine needle duff, and rock outcroppings. Therefore, existing drainage is primarily infiltrated into soil. The proposed project would not alter Squaw Creek. To ensure no direct or indirect discharge of sediments into Squaw Creek, temporary and permanent water quality best management practices will be incorporated into construction activities and project design. The project's potential impacts associated with water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing applicable Placer County General Plan and Squaw Valley General Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures- Item VIII-11:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VIII.1

Refer to text in MM VIII.2

Refer to text in MM VIII.3

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				x
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			x	

3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			x	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				x
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				x
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				x
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)			x	
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)			x	

Discussion- Item: IX-1:

The project as proposed will not physically divide an established community in that the expanded halfpipe will contribute to the existing operations of the ski hill and will continue to be a part of the ski hill operations.

Discussion- Item: IX-2:

The project site is located within the Squaw Valley General Plan, Forest Recreation District. Ski lifts and ski trails are permitted principal uses and structures within the Forest Recreation District. Permitting active recreational development is the intent of the Forest Recreation District of the Squaw Valley General Plan while at the same time retains the general character of the forest environment. The proposed project is not necessarily new disturbance as the halfpipe currently exists and improvements are proposed to be made to the halfpipe within its existing location. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item: IX-3:

The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. The project as designed will avoid any environmental effects to habitat. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item: IX-4:

The project is currently used as a halfpipe within the existing operations of the Squaw Valley ski hill. The expansion of the halfpipe will continue to be compatible with the existing operations of the terrain halfpipe and ski hill operations. In fact, it will provide a controlled environment for snowboarders and skiers which will lessen their impacts to other unimproved areas of the resort. Therefore, the project will not result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts.

Discussion- Item: IX-5:

The project will not affect agricultural and timber resources or operations in that the project will not impact soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans or create an incompatible land use.

Discussion- Item: IX-6:

The established community is a ski hill operation. Therefore, the project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established ski community. The project will not divide the physical arrangement of a low-income or minority community in that none exists.

Discussion- Item: IX-7:

The project proposes a halfpipe of approximately 500-feet in length with sidewalls up to about 16-feet in vertical height. The interior and exterior sidewalls of halfpipe will be sloped at inclinations of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical (1H: 1V) or flatter. According to the Grading Plan prepared by Gary Davis Group cuts and fills up to approximately 25-feet in depth will be required for construction of the halfpipe and about 12,200 cubic yards of soil will be disturbed, most of which will be reused onsite as fill material. Vegetation within the construction limits consist of native brush and grass.

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared by Holdrege & Kull in October of 2006. The report concluded that the project can be constructed as designed and that there are no issues with regards to the soils or construction techniques which would create a significant impact which could not otherwise be mitigated.

The project will result in an alteration to the existing halfpipe; however, it will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of the area. The project includes improvements to the existing halfpipe which will allow for greater use of the halfpipe and of the ski hill operations. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item: IX-8:

The project as proposed will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration. The project will allow for additional activities to take place at the proposed halfpipe which will further the economic and social situations on the ski hill. No mitigation measures are required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				x
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				x

Discussion- All Items:

In October of 2006, Holdrege & Kull prepared a Geotechnical Engineering Report for the project. The report concluded that the site is generally underlain by near-surface granitic rock with isolated flows of altered volcanic rock. There are no known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state within the project site area. Furthermore, concluding that there will not be a loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource, in that there is not a recovery site delineated within the Squaw Valley General Plan.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (EHS)		x		
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)				x
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)		x		
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				x
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				x

Discussion- Item XI-1,3:

The project is located at least one mile away from the nearest sensitive receptor on a ski slope of Squaw Valley. Based on the location of the project and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor, a detailed noise study was not required. However, construction noise from grading and blasting activities may noticeably increase noise levels above existing ambient noise levels. This is a potentially significant event.

Mitigation Measures- Items XI-1,3:

MM XI.1 In order to mitigate the potential impacts of blasting and construction noise noted above, construction or blasting noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays, and shall only occur:

- Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)
- Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)
- Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm

Impulsive noise produced by blasting shall not exceed a peak linear overpressure of 122 db, or a C-weighted Sound Exposure Level (SEL) of 98 dBC. The cumulative noise level from impulsive sounds such as blasting shall not exceed 60 dB L_Cdn or C_{NELC} on any given day. These standards shall be applied at the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor.

In addition, a temporary sign (4' x 4') shall be located throughout the project, as determined by the DRC, at key locations and in areas accessible to the general public depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations. This condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans and shown in the development notebook.

Essentially, quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, such as a house under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well.

The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.

Discussion- Item XI-2:

The project will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

Discussion- Item XI-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two mile of a public airport.

Discussion- Item XI-5:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				x
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				x

Discussion- All Items:

The project site is located within the existing operations of a recreational ski facility. The project site will not induce substantial population growth in the Squaw Valley area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure) in that the project is an expansion of an existing halfpipe which will not create the need for additional homes or businesses nor is within an area currently developed with roads or other infrastructure providing access to residences. Furthermore, the expansion of the halfpipe will not displace any existing housing in that no existing housing exists within the general vicinity of

the existing halfpipe nor will the project necessitate the construction of replacement housing in that no existing housing is proposed to be removed or replaced as a result of the proposed expansion to the existing halfpipe.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				x
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				x
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				x
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				x
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				x

Discussion- All Items:

The project is an expansion to the existing halfpipe currently in operation at the Squaw Valley ski resort and is currently served by the public service providers for both utilities and safety. The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities. It is intended that the modified project will continue to be served by the existing service and safety providers and the expansion to the halfpipe will not create a substantial impact to their service, including but not limited to, response times or other performance objectives of any of the public services.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				x
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)		x		

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The project site is currently a recreational halfpipe within the existing terrain park of the Squaw Valley ski hill. The modification to the existing halfpipe will provide additional recreational opportunities, professional demonstrations, and competitions and/or trials events for games plus daily recreational use. The improvements to the existing halfpipe will substantially improve the existing operations and facilities of the Riviera Halfpipe accelerating the use of the halfpipe and terrain park. The closest public park or recreation area is the Squaw Valley Regional Park which is approximately four miles from the project site. The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The project does include the modification to existing recreational facilities and proposes the construction of the expansion to the existing halfpipe. Specifically, the proposed halfpipe will be approximately 500-feet in length with sidewalls up to about 16-feet in vertical height. The interior and exterior sidewalls of the proposed halfpipe will be sloped at inclinations of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical (1H: 1V) or flatter. Cuts and fills up to approximately 25-feet in depth will be required for construction of the halfpipe modification and about 12,200 cubic yards of soil will be disturbed, most of which will be reused onsite as fill material.

In October of 2006, a geotechnical engineering report was prepared by Holdrege & Kull. The report concluded the following:

1. The soil conditions encountered generally consisted of dense granular soil types of low plasticity that are suitable for reuse as engineered fill and should provide adequate support for the planned embankments. No highly plastic, compressible, or potentially expansive soil was encountered.
2. Strong granitic rock was present and a large track-mounted excavator equipped with a ripper tooth or hydraulic hammer and blasting will likely be required at the site.
3. Cut slopes should be stable at slopes of 1H: 1V or flatter, for vertical heights up to 16-feet. Jointing and fracturing within the granite rock exposed in cuts should be observed by a representative of Holdrege & Kull at the time of construction with respect to block stability.
4. Fill slopes constructed using on-site soil similar to that encountered in the test pits or imported granular soil should be stable at slopes of 2H: 1V or flatter, for vertical height up to 16-feet. Fill slopes constructed at inclinations steeper than 2H: 1V and flatter than 1H: 1V will require the use of geogrid reinforcement for stability.
5. Slopes at the site will be exposed to a significant amount of snow melt and runoff, and therefore will be subject to a high potential for erosion. Where possible, all slopes steeper than 2H: 1V should be protected with rock slope protection (RSP). Where RSP is not feasible, such as the interior sidewalls of the halfpipe, special attention should be paid to reducing the potential flow of surface water over the face of the slope.
6. Groundwater was not encountered during the subsurface exploration to the maximum depth explored. However, perched groundwater could develop above onsite rock and cause seasonal groundwater seepage in deeper excavations.

As a result of the conclusions of the field observations, engineering analysis, and the experience of the engineers of Holdrege & Kull in the project area, the report provided recommendations including, but not limited to, clearing and grubbing, preparation for fill placement, fill placement, slope stability and construction, erosion control, surface water drainage, and rock slope protection. It is staff's opinion that provided that the construction of the project adheres to the recommendations of the geotechnical report that the potential adverse impacts from the modification to the existing halfpipe will mitigate the physical effects on the environment to a less than significant impact.

Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with the requirements of the County and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB).

Mitigation Measures- Item XIV-2:

MM XIV.1 Prior to the improvement plans approval, the improvement plans shall incorporate the recommendations of the geotechnical report prepared by Holdrege & Kull in October of 2006. The recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, clearing and grubbing, preparation for fill placement, fill placement, slope stability and construction, erosion control, surface water drainage, and rock slope protection.

MM XIV.2 If blasting is required for the project and for the installation of site improvements, the developer shall comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations.

MM XIV.3 All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation, tree impacts and tree removal shall be shown on the Grading Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Section 15.48, Placer County Code) and the Placer County Flood Control District's Stormwater Management Manual. The applicant shall pay plan check fees and inspection fees. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Grading Plans are approved and any required temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with the Grading Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Grading Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

MM XIV.4 Prior to construction, a Best Management Practices (BMP's) plan shall be submitted to the Placer County Planning Division for review and approval of the BMPs. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, stormwater prevention plan and techniques, protection of runoff during and after construction of the project, etc.

MM XIV.5 Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a plan identifying the procedures in the event of extra fill or removal of dirt or boulders or other debris from the site. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, amount of fill imported and/or exported, identifying where the fill will be exposed of, where boulders are removed to if encountered, identify type of compaction to occur, where materials are brought in from, incorporation of BMP's, etc.

XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)				x
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)				x
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				x
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				x
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				x
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				x
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				x
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				x

Discussion- All Items:

The existing access to the project site is by a private mountain access road: Squaw Valley Ski Corp Summer Access Road. The project site does not front on a public road. The project is not anticipated to generate additional traffic because the project scope does not propose any features that would increase maintenance trips or user capacity. Because no increase in traffic is associated with this project, there is no impact on congestion, the level of service established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan, parking capacity, or air traffic patterns. Because no changes to road design or other transportation features is proposed, there is no impact on vehicle safety, emergency access, hazards or barriers for pedestrians, or policies supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				x
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				x
3. Require or result in the construction of new septic systems? (EHS)				x
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				x
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)				x
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)				x
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (EHS)				x
8. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (EHS)				x

Discussion- Item XVI-1:

This project does not propose any uses that would generate the need for sewer, water or storm water facilities. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-2:

The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

This project does not propose any uses that would generate the need for sewer, water or storm water facilities. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

The project will not require sewage disposal and will not require or result in the construction of a new septic system.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

This project does not propose any uses that would generate the need for sewer, water or storm water facilities. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-5,6,7,8:

This project will not require water, sewer, refuse disposal, or solid waste disposal services, as the project will not generate wastewater, refuse, solid waste or require treated water. Therefore, this project will not result in any impacts associated with the provision of water, sewer, refuse disposal, or solid waste disposal services or the ability for this project to comply with Federal, State and Local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		x
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		x
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		x

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, Stacy Wydra, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Sarah K. Gillmore, P. E.
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller
 Air Pollution Control District, Brent Backus
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell
 Placer County Fire / CDF, Bob Eicholtz

Signature 

Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

Date March 6, 2007

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Holdrege & Kull (10/2006)
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening

		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____